

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 7-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imasu et al. (US 6,208,525) in view of Iijima et al. (US 2003/0011070).

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imasu et al. in view of Iijima et al.

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claim 7 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 7-14 are currently pending.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 7-9 and 11-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imasu et al. (US 6,208,525) in view of Iijima et al. (US 2003/0011070), and claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Imasu et al. in view of Iijima et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for the following reasons.

Independent claim 7, as amended, recites a package substrate including, in part, “a first copper plated layer on predetermined portions of the base substrate, which serves as a plating lead line. See Fig. 6b and page 13, lines 22-25 of the present specification. In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention none of the cited references teach or suggest this feature. Therefore, none of the cited references teach or disclose a package substrate manufactured in a semi-additive manner without using any plating lead line, thereby being capable of achieving improvements in line density, as is taught by the present invention. Moreover, the present claims

recite a package substrate that removes all plating lead lines used in the normal electrolytic Au plating process, thus suppressing noise. None of the cited references teach or suggest Applicants' presently claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Imasu et al. and Iijima et al., whether taken singly or combined, fail to teach or suggest "a first copper plated layer on predetermined portions of the base substrate, which serves as a plating lead line," as recited by amended independent claim 7, and hence dependent claims 8-14.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn because the applied art does not teach or suggest the novel combination of features recited in amended independent claim 7, and hence dependent claims 8-14.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

By: Mary Jane Boswell
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652

Dated: August 24, 2005

Customer No.: 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202.739.3000
Facsimile: 202.739.3001